## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Applicant further requests withdrawal of the finality of prosecution. Claims 1-6 and 22-26 are pending.

### Telephone Conference

Upon receipt of the Final Action dated Jan. 24, 2002, the undersigned attorney called Examiner Kim to discuss the Final Action. From comments made in the "Response to Arguments" section (Page 4 of Final Action), there appeared to be some misunderstanding of the claimed subject matter. More specifically and using claim 1 as an example, there appeared to be some misunderstanding that the recited device (which communicates with the removable storage card) is itself "constructed in a form factor of a PCMCIA card". Thus, when assembled, the claimed two-component assembly (i.e., the "device" and "storage card" in claim 1), can together be inserted into a PCMCIA card reader. Since this misunderstanding only became apparent from comments made in the Final Action, the telephone conference was timely.

Following discussion of the pending claims and cited art, the Examiner concluded that he would reconsider the current rejections. A few days later, the Examiner called the undersigned attorney and indicated that the claims did appear to be allowable over the cited art. Thus, agreement was reached that the current rejections should be withdrawn. The Examiner suggested that Applicant file a Request for Reconsideration and request that the Office withdraw its finality. It is the undersigned attorney's understanding that, pending any further searching and

assuming that no new art is cited, all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

The remaining discussion contains the same remarks presented in the previous Response filed Nov. 19, 2001.

**35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-5 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,701,884 to Dedrick (hereinafter, "Dedrick"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The claimed invention concerns a portable profile carrier that stores and securely transports a user's profile and personal user data files from one computer to the next. The profile carrier is a two-component assembly comprising a storage card (e.g., smart card) and a card reader.

In one exemplary implementation, the card reader is physically constructed in a form factor of a PCMCIA card and has a slot to receive the storage card. The card reader has a card interface and controller to facilitate data communication with the storage card. The reader is equipped with data memory (e.g., flash memory) to store the user profile and data files. The storage card protects access to the data memory in the card reader. The composite profile carrier alternately enables access to the user profile on the flash memory when the card is present and the user is authenticated, while disabling access when the card is removed or the user is not authenticated within a certain time period.

To access the contents in the data memory, the user assembles the card reader and storage card and inserts the assembled carrier into a PCMCIA device reader at the computer. The user is prompted to enter a passcode and the storage

card authenticates the user by comparing the user-supplied passcode to a passcode stored on the storage card. Assuming that the user is legitimate, the storage card authenticates the card reader. If valid, access to the user profile and data files on the data memory is permitted.

**Claim 1** defines an assembly comprising "a device constructed in a form factor of a PCMCIA card, the device having an interface to communicate with a storage card and memory to store user data". The assembly further comprises "a removable storage card associated with a user that alternately enables access to the user data on the memory when interfaced with the device interface and disables access to the user data when removed from the device."

The recited assembly is not shown by the Dedrick reference. That is, Dedrick does not show an assembly that includes ***both*** "a device constructed in a form factor of a PCMCIA card [with] an interface to communicate with a storage card and memory to store user data" ***and*** "a removable storage card ... that alternately enables access to the user data on the memory when interfaced with the device interface and disables access to the user data when removed from the device." Please refer to the example construction illustrated in Figs. 2 and 3 of the Applicant's Specification. The assembly includes both the PCMCIA device (e.g., card reader 60) and the storage card (e.g., card 62). The PCMCIA device has memory (e.g., flash memory 70) to store user data and an interface (e.g., card I/F 66) to communicate with the storage card. When the card is inserted into the PCMCIA device, the composite assembly can then be inserted into a PCMCIA drive on the computer.

Dedrick merely shows a conventional system that employs only a smart card to carry a user's profile. Dedrick is entirely void of any disclosure of "a

device constructed in a form factor of a PCMCIA card [with] an interface to communicate with a storage card and memory to store user data". Dedrick has no concept of the recited two-component assembly, and hence does not discuss or suggest the PCMCIA reader device.

Moreover, Dedrick represents the very prior art that Applicant sought to improve. Dedrick describes use of a smart card 11 to store minimum user information. Additional user information is kept on a personal profile server connected to a network system. To change the residence of the information to a new computer, the minimum user information on the smart card 11 is used to secure a connection between the computer and the profile server of the network system. This is akin to the description provided in the "Background" section of the subject application, which discusses use of "smart card tokens" assigned to users to store such information as the user name, domain name, and password. (See, Applicant's Specification, paragraph 5 or page 2, lines 12-17).

The Office does not address the claimed features of an "assembly", and appears to have misread the claims. More specifically, the Office fails to indicate how the Dedrick reference teaches the two-component assembly that includes both a "device constructed in a form factor of a PCMCIA card" and "a removable storage card." The Office only points to a PCMCIA smart card 11 as having flash memory. (Office Action, Page 3, lines 1-6). In claim 1, however, the "device" is separate from the "storage card". The "device" has a PCMCIA form factor and the claimed "memory to store user data". The storage card can be alternately interfaced with or removed from the device. Thus, application of a PCMCIA smart card fails to satisfy the claimed features.

Perhaps the Office interprets the claimed "device" as being met by the client computer 12. This interpretation, however, would not satisfy the claim language that the device "has a PCMCIA form factor". Accordingly, the Office's arguments advanced in the Office Action do not correlate with the claimed subject matter and hence, do not support of the §102 rejection.

For the reasons given above, the Dedrick patent fails to show the assembly of claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. Additionally, these claims recite features that, when taken together with those of claim 1, define assemblies not described by Dedrick.

For example, claim 4 requires that the device store "a user's profile that can be used to configure a computer." Dedrick is entirely silent as to any such "device" as Applicant claims and hence, provides no discussion of such a device storing a user profile. Moreover, Dedrick describes the smart card as storing user information, and hence teaches away from having a different device store such information. For these additional reasons, claim 4 is allowable over Dedrick.

Claim 5 requires that "access to the user data in the memory of the device is enabled upon authentication of a user-supplied passcode to the passcode stored on the storage card." Dedrick provides no discussion of this security protocol in which the PCMCIA device and separate storage card interact to secure access to the user data. Accordingly, claim 5 is allowable over Dedrick for this additional reason.

Independent claim 22 requires "a computer having a PCMCIA device reader" and "a smart card secured memory assembly having a form factor of a PCMCIA card to compatibly interface with the PCMCIA device reader in the

computer". Claim 22 further requires that the smart card secured memory assembly have "data memory to store user data and a removable smart card that alternately enables access to the user data when present and disables access to the user data when removed."

Dedrick is entirely silent as to "a smart card secured memory assembly" that includes "data memory to store user data" and a separate "removable smart card". Furthermore, Dedrick has no discussion whatsoever of an assembly where the removable smart card "alternately enables access to the user data when present and disables access to the user data when removed." Rather, Dedrick merely shows the conventional system of employing a smart card to hold user profile information.

Accordingly, claim 22 is patentable over Dedrick. Application respectfully requests withdrawal of the §102 rejection.

**Claims 23-24** depend from claim 22 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. Additionally, these claims recite features that, when taken together with those of claim 22, define computer systems not described by Dedrick. Additionally, claim 24 is also allowable for similar reasons given above with respect to claim 5.

**35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 6, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,038,551 to Barlow et al. (hereinafter, "Barlow"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Office admits that Dedrick fails to teach the features recited in claims 6, 25, and 26. Accordingly, the Office cites Barlow as teaching an encryption

scheme where smart card 14 holds a private key and the host 12 has a public key. It is noted that the Barlow patent is assigned to Microsoft Corporation, the assignee of the subject application. Barlow has very little relevance to the claimed invention, other than it shows use of a smart card 12. Barlow provides no teaching of the claimed secured memory *assembly* having a PCMCIA device that interfaces with and reads a storage card; instead, like Dedrick, Barlow merely shows use of a smart card.

Accordingly, Barlow adds nothing to the teachings of Dedrick with regard to the claimed assembly found in claims 1 and 22. Both references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest an assembly having "a device constructed in a form factor of a PCMCIA card [with] an interface to communicate with a storage card and memory to store user data" and "a removable storage card associated with a user that alternately enables access to the user data on the memory when interfaced with the device interface and disables access to the user data when removed from the device." as recited in claim 1. As such, claim 6 (which depends from claim 1) is allowable over the combination of Dedrick and Barlow.

Likewise, the Dedrick/Barlow combination does not teach or suggest "a smart card secured memory assembly having a form factor of a PCMCIA card to compatibly interface with the PCMCIA device reader in the computer" where the smart card secured memory assembly has "data memory to store user data and a removable smart card that alternately enables access to the user data when present and disables access to the user data when removed" as required by claim 22. Thus, claims 25-26 (which depend from claim 22) are allowable over the cited combination.

**C nclusion**

All pending claims 1-6 and 22-26 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/6/2002 By: _____

Lewis C. Lee
Reg. No. 34,656
(509) 324-9256 ext. 211